IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BRIAN COOPER

7015 Woolston Avenue

Philadelphia, PA 19138

and

LESTER PEAK

1251 North 27th Street

Philadelphia, PA 19121

and

CURTIS GARDNER

3367 Frankford Avenue

Philadelphia, PA 19134

and

CHARLES RICHARDSON

6529 North Woodstock Street

Philadelphia, PA 19138

and

HARRY JAMES

1622 South Yewdall St.

Philadelphia, PA 19143

Plaintiffs,

v.

LIFE STAR AMBULANCE, INC.

15 Ardrossan Ave.

West Chester, PA 19382-7283

and

MICHAEL KLING

c/o Life Star Ambulance, Inc.

15 Ardrossan Ave.

West Chester, PA 19382-7283

and

LEE SCHWARTZ

c/o Life Star Ambulance, Inc.

15 Ardrossan Ave.

West-Chester, PA-1-9382-7283

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.:

DOCKET NO

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

COLLECTIVE ACTION ON BEHALF

OF PLAINTIFFS AND ALL SIMILARLY

SITUATED PERSONS

COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Lester Peak, Brian Cooper, Curtis Gardner, and Charles Richardson (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Plaintiffs" unless otherwise indicated), on behalf of themselves and all employees/former employees who are similarly situated to them hereby bring this collective action against Defendants.

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs have initiated the instant collective action to redress violations by Defendants of the Fair Labor Standards Act "FLSA" (29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et. seq.). Plaintiffs assert that Defendants failed to pay them overtime compensation along with all employees/former employees who are similarly situated to them and who also worked as drivers for any of Defendants' locations.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of civil rights under such federal laws.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because their contacts with this State and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.

4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

PARTIES

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 6. Plaintiffs are adult *sui juris* individuals with addresses as set forth above.
- 7. Defendant Life Star Ambulance Inc. ("Defendant Company") is a company that provides medical transportation services in several states throughout the United States, and it is headquartered at the above-captioned address.
- 8. Defendant Michael Kling is upon information and belief the owner and/or supervisor of Defendant Company who oversees daily operations, manages operations, and who exercises authority and control over the terms and conditions of employees including but not limited to terms of compensation, wages and pay of employees (including Plaintiffs).
- 9. Defendant Lee Schwartz is upon information and belief a high level manager and supervisor of Ambulance Drivers for Defendant Company. This person, at all times relevant herein, managed Plaintiffs and exercises/exercised authority and control over the terms and conditions of Plaintiffs and other employees including but not limited to terms of compensation, wages and pay of employees.
- 10. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through their agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 11. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 12. Plaintiffs consist of employees who worked for Defendants dating back 3 years from the filing of the instant lawsuit.
- 13. Plaintiff Cooper worked for Defendant Company for approximately five (5) years.
- 14. Plaintiff Peak has worked for Defendant Company for approximately three (3) years.
- 15. Plaintiff Gardner worked for Defendant Company for approximately two and one half (2.5) years.
- 16. Plaintiff Richardson worked for Defendant Company for approximately two (2) years.
- 17. Plaintiff James worked for Defendant Company for approximately three (3) years.
- 18. Defendant Company is a transportation service which employs drivers who are considered to perform para-transit-related services/duties.
- 19. All four (4) Plaintiffs were employed as para-transit drivers for Defendant Company.
- 20. Plaintiffs' job responsibilities (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) have consisted of driving and transporting clients to and from locations within Pennsylvania, specifically the greater Philadelphia region.
 - 21. Plaintiffs did not perform any work for Defendants outside of Pennsylvania.

- 22. None of the four (4) Plaintiffs possess commercial driver's licenses, nor were they required to possess such licenses in order to perform their jobs for Defendants.
- 23. Plaintiffs did not have responsibilities to supervise employees of Defendants, discipline employees of Defendants, or to hire or terminate employees of Defendants during their respective tenures with Defendants.
- 24. Plaintiffs did not have responsibilities to make management or business decisions for Defendants relating to purchasing assets, marketing, sales/financial targets, or other company financial decisions.
- 25. Plaintiffs and other drivers similarly situated to them were originally paid hourly rates until Defendants, at varying times, tried to falsely refer to them as to independent contractors.
- 26. At times when Defendants knowingly and intentionally referred to Plaintiffs and similarly situated employees as independent contractors solely to avoid state and/or federal wage obligations, such employees were not properly paid overtime compensation.
- 27. Even though Plaintiffs and other drivers that were similarly situated to Plaintiffs were switched from being paid hourly to other varying rates of pay (such as unlawful flat rates), Plaintiffs remained employees of Defendant Company as they were still paid by Defendant Company, still wore the same uniform, worked under the same owner, and received reports and assignments from the same dispatcher, as when they worked for Defendant Company.
- 28. Despite being called independent contractors by Defendants to avoid state and/or federal wage obligations, Plaintiffs were never independent contractors and continued to operate in the same manner as when they were referred to as employees under the same/similar work schedules.

5

- 29. Throughout their employment, Plaintiffs and other drivers similarly situated to them worked (and continue to work) well over 40 hours per week and often worked (and continue to work) from 10-20 hours of overtime per week.
- 30. Plaintiffs and other drivers similarly situated to them were not paid time and one half for hours that they worked in excess forty (40) hours a week during the time that Defendant Company considered them "independent contractors" and at other times when the employees were mischaracterized and/or cheated out of legally entitled earnings.
- 31. During Plaintiffs' employment with Defendants, Plaintiffs were never paid by salary.
- 32. Defendants have and continue to perpetuate a system whereby they intentionally fail to abide by overtime laws, which is evidenced by:
 - a. Defendants' false conversion of employees to flat rates and other forms of varying pay instead of hourly rates to further conceal overtime violations;
 - b. Defendants converting Plaintiffs into independent contractors to conceal overtime violations; and
 - c. Defendants failing to keep proper records of all hours worked by Plaintiffs.
 - d. Defendants failing to pay Plaintiffs and other drivers similarly situated to them time and one half for the hours they worked over forty (40) hours a week during the time that Defendants considered them "independent contractors."
- pay policies and practices designed and orchestrated to evade federal wage laws and have failed to pay employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs proper overtime wages.

6

Count I <u>Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA")</u> (Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation) - Against All Defendants -

- 34. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 35. At all times relevant herein, Defendants have and continue to be "employers" within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §203 ("FLSA").
- 36. At all times relevant herein, Defendants to this Action were responsible for paying wages to Plaintiffs and employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs.
- 37. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs were employed with Defendants as "employee[s]" within the meaning of the FLSA, as were employees who also worked as drivers and who were similarly situated to Plaintiffs.
- 38. The FLSA requires covered employers, such as Defendants, to minimally compensate its "non-exempt" employees, such as Plaintiff, 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for each hour that the employee works over 40 in a workweek.
- 39. At all times during his employment with Defendants, Plaintiffs were "non-exempt" employees within the meaning of the FLSA.

Defendants' violations of the FLSA as to Plaintiffs and employees who are/were similarly situated to Plaintiffs include, but are not limited to:

- a. Not paying them at least 1.5 times their regular hourly rate of pay for all hours-worked-in-excess-of-forty-per-work-week;
- b. Not using proper record keeping mandated by the Department of Labor to ensure that they were paid for each and every hour they worked; and

- c. Converting their employment from an hourly rate employee to an independent contractor with a flat rate per ride to avoid FLSA regulations and conceal overtime violations (and other forms overtime withholding/non-payment).
- 40. Defendant Individuals are personally liable because they were high-level management responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiffs including but not limited to their compensation.
- 41. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs the wages and overtime compensation due them and other employees who also worked as drivers and who were similarly situated to Plaintiffs, Defendants violated the FLSA, causing Plaintiffs and similarly situated employees to suffer damages.
- * WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court enter an Order providing that:
 - (1) Defendants are to be prohibited from continuing to maintain their illegal policy, practice or customs in violation of state and federal wage laws;
 - (2) Defendants are to compensate, reimburse, and make Plaintiffs and all employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs whole for any and all pay and benefits they would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings and wages. They should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld.
 - (3) Plaintiffs and employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs should be awarded liquidated

 damages as applicable under the laws which they are suing in an amount believed to
 be appropriate to deter such conduct by Defendants in the future; and

(4) Plaintiff and employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs are to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable legal fees as provided by applicable federal and state law.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

Date: November 29, 2012

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

	Brun Coop	er, et al.	CIVIL ACTION			
JÆ.	Star Ambu	iance, inc, et al.	NO.	· .		
	In accordance with the plaintiff shall complet filing the complaint and side of this form.) In designation, that defer the plaintiff and all other shall of the plaintiff and all other shall be s	e Civil Justice Expense and Delay Re a Case Management Track Designated serve a copy on all defendants. (Seen the event that a defendant does not adant shall, with its first appearance, sher parties, a Case Management Track the believes the case should be assigned.	tion Form in all civil cases at the tin § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse agree with the plaintiff regarding submit to the clerk of court and serve to be served by the server of the serv	ne of erse said		
	SELECT ONE OF T	HE FOLLOWING CASE MANAG	EMENT TRACKS:	•		
	(a) Habeas Corpus – C	Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 224	1 through § 2255.	()		
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
	(c) Arbitration - Case	s required to be designated for arbitra	tion under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()		
	 (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special 					
	management cases			()		
	(f) Standard Managen	nent – Cases that do not fall into any	one of the other tracks.	(X)		
	11/29/2017 Date	Ari R. Karpf Attorney-at-law	Plaintiff Attorney for			
	(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com			
	Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:12-cv-06662-NIQA Document 1 Filed 11/29/12 Page 11 of 14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	ne used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: SEE OHFICHED, SNULT	
COP MACIADA SIADA	
Address of Defendant: State of Defendant State of D	SIDGE DE LOUGUA DE
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side Fol A.	Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yesu No 🗓
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
	Date Terminated.
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year.	<u> </u>
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior s	Yes No I
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact of grow out of the same transaction as a prior s action in this court?	suit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No□
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier r	
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	
	Yes□ No□
CIVIL: (Place / in one category only)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases;
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	
	3. D Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. A Labor-Management Relations	6. D Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. D Civil Rights	7. D Products Liability
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases	
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERT (Check Appropriate Co. I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record do hereby certif	ategory)
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000:00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 11/21/2012	ARK2484
Attorney-staLaw	Attorney I.D.# 91538
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	re has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	
DATE: 11/29/2012	ARK2484
Attornoy-at-Law	Address I D. //
CIV. 609 (5/2012)	Attorney 1.D.# 91538

Plaintiff Contact Information

Brian Cooper 7015 Woolston Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19138

Lester Peak 1251 North 27th Street Philadelphia, PA 19121

Curtis Gardner 3367 Frankford Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19134

Charles Richardson 6529 North Woodstock Street Philadelphia, PA 19138

Harry James 1622 South Yewdall St. Philadelphia, PA 19143

Defendant Contact Information

Life Star Ambulance, Inc. 15 Ardrossan Ave. West Chester, PA 19382-7283

Michael Kling c/o Life Star Ambulance, Inc. 15 Ardrossan Ave. West Chester, PA 19382-7283

Lee Schwartz c/o Life Star Ambulance, Inc. 15 Ardrossan Ave. West Chester, PA 19382-7283

Case 2:12-cv-06662-NIOA Document 1 Filed 11/29/12 Page 14 of 14 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE I	NSTRÜCTIONS ON THE REVE	ERSE OF THE FORM.)							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS LIEE STAD AMPLII ANCE INC. et al.					
BRIAN COOPER,		LIFE STAR AMBULANCE, INC., et al.							
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Plaintiff	Philadelphia	County of	Residence of	f First Listed	Defendant .	Chester		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ame, Address, Telephone N	ımber and Email Addr	ress) NO	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE					
Karpf, Karpf & Ce					NVOLVED.			.01101 11	L
Two Greenwood			Attorneys (f Known)					
PA 19020, (215)	039-0801, akarpi(@karpt-law.com	n						
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. CITIZENS	HIP OF PI	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in	One Box fo	r Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question		(For Diversity	Cases Only) PT	F DEF		and One Box i	for Defenda PTF	nt) DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizen of This Stat		1 🗇 1	Incorporated or Pri of Business In This		□ 4	□ 4
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citizen of Another	State 🗇	2 . 🗇 2	Incorporated and F		a 5	· 5
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	027 0.17			of Business In A	Another State	_	
			Citizen or Subject of Foreign Country	fa 🗇	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box O	nly) VKS	anta consanue	ESTANGE	ANTEKSES.	Kanowa waka	is continue	ASOXVIII	S
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury -				al 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State R ☐ 410 Antitru	eapportion	
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpractice	☐ 625 Dnig Relate	d Seizure		SC 157	☐ 430 Banks	and Banking	3
 ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment 	Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	of Property:		KATE TO VA	vavii(divessa	_ 450 Comme	erce	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers'	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product	☐ 640 R.R. & True ☐ 650 Airline Reg		 820 Copy 830 Paten 		☐ 470 Racket	eer Influenc t Organizati	ed and
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Liability	☐ 660 Occupations	d.	□ 840 Trade		☐ 480 Consur	ner Credit	ons
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud	☐ 690 Other				☐ 490 Cable/S ☐ 810 Selective	lat TV ve Service	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	710 Fair Labor		SGCIAU B61 HIA	SECURITYONS (1395ft)	■ 850 Securit Exchan	ies/Commo	dities/
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damage	Act		□ 862 Black	Lung (923)	☐ 875 Custom	ner Challeng	ge '
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 720 Labor/Mgm ☐ 730 Labor/Mgm		☐ 864 SSID		12 USC 890 Other S	Statutory Ac	tions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	HURISONERRETATION	& Disclosur 740 Railway La		□ 865 RSI (405(g)) 164 AXISUITISES	_ □ 891 Agricul	ltural Acts	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting	510 Motions to Vacate	☐ 790 Other Labor	Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes	s (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Enviro	nmental Ma	itters
	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence Habeas Corpus:	☐ 791 Empl. Ret. I Security Ac		□ 871 IRS-		□ 894 Energy □ 895 Freedon	Allocation : m of Inform	Act ation
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 444 Welfare	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty	MEXICUM MICHA	ALIONE MANA	26 US	SC 7609	Act 900Appeal	of Fee Dete	rmination
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	540 Mandannis & Othe550 Civil Rights		on Application			Under E	Equal Acces	
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -		Alien Detain	ee			to Justic	utionality of	7
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights		465 Other Immi Actions	gration			State St	atutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)		····					Appeal to I	District
1 Original 2 Re	emoved from 🔲 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reinstated or E Reopened	anothe	erred from district	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation	rict 🗇 7 J	ludge from Magistrate	1
		ntute under which you ar ndards Act "FLS		specif) jurisdictiona		~	J	ludgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of ca	ause:	SA" 29USC20	<u>1</u>					
VII. REQUESTED IN	Violations of CHECK IF THIS		DEMAND \$			HECK YES only	if demanded in		
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	DEWIAND 3			URY DEMAND	1/	□ No	:
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):				20011	777	7		
		JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER —			
Explanation:									
11/2/1/2014			<u> </u>						
DATB		SIGNATURE OF	FATTORNEY OF I	RECORD					
<u> </u>									

Save As... Export as PDF

Retrieve PDF File

Reset